

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 3, and 6 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the April 19, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,407 B2 (hereinafter the Maruyama reference). The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Maruyama reference in view of Honda et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,015,939 B2. (hereinafter the Honda reference). The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Maruyama reference. The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Maruyama reference in view of the Honda reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended recites:

A method of controlling an operation of an optical disc recording apparatus capable of recording record information onto an optical disc and forming an image corresponding to image information on the optical disc, the method comprising the steps of:

determining an operation of recording the record information by the optical disc recording apparatus and an operation of forming the image corresponding to the image information by the optical disc recording apparatus; and

giving instructions for starting recording of the record information and instructions for starting formation of the image corresponding to the image information to the optical disc recording apparatus after the determining step, wherein the record information is

recorded and the image is formed on a same side of the optical disc by applying a laser beam.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Maruyama reference.

The Maruyama reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended. Unlike the method specified in independent claim 1, as amended, the Maruyama reference does not show that "the record information is recorded and the image is formed on a same side of the optical disc by applying a laser beam".

The Maruyama reference discloses printing information on a surface of an optical disc, but fails to disclose forming an image on a data recording surface using a laser beam.

The Maruyama reference states that "when optical disc 10 is of one-side read type (independently of one or two recording layers), substrate 14 on the rear side viewed from read-out surface 19 need not always be transparent to the read/write laser beam used. In this case, a label may be printed on the entire surface of substrate 14 on the rear side." (Col. 6, lines 27-32.)

The Maruyama reference also states that "MPU 30" is connected to printer interface P1. Printer interface P1 is connected to printer P2. Printer P2 prints out images based on various data played back from optical disc 10 to predetermined locations (an optical disc, a label added to an optical disc, a cartridge which stores an optical disc, and the like)." (Col. 27, line 65 - col. 28 line 28.)

The Maruyama reference does not show that "the record information is recorded

and the image is formed on a same side of the optical disc by applying a laser beam”.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended distinguishes over the above-cited reference. Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 2 also distinguishes over the above-cited reference.

Independent claim 3, as amended, recites limitations similar to independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, independent claim 3, as amended, recites that “the record information is recorded and the image is formed on a same side of the optical disc by applying a laser beam”. Therefore, independent claim 3 also distinguishes over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 3, as amended. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 also distinguish over the above-cited reference.

Independent claim 6, as amended, recites limitations similar to independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, independent claim 6, as amended, recites that “the record information is recorded and the image is formed on a same side of the optical disc by applying a laser beam”. Therefore, independent claim 6 also distinguishes over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 7-14 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 6, as amended. Therefore, claims 7-14 also distinguish over the above-cited reference.

///

///

///

///

Applicant believes that the foregoing amendment and remarks place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: October 18, 2007

By: _____



Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033